

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19891

Why is it that the United States takes the inconsistent position that the State Department, when it comes to Latin America and this hemisphere, cannot become involved in matters within the sovereignty of these other countries and we cannot impose our will upon these other nations, when according to the answer given by the gentleman in the well to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] just a moment ago, it appears we are imposing our will on South Vietnam? Of course, it is common knowledge that we did in Guatemala, in 1954, when there was a Communist government. That was a case in which we rendered assistance to oust the Communists.

It seems to me that we have either got to fish or cut bait. In one situation we intervene supposedly to strengthen our anti-Communist efforts but in another situation where the Communist threaten we say that we have got to recognize their sovereignty and we cannot intervene.

If we are to be consistent, should not our basic policy be that we fight communism wherever it occurs, if it justifies interference in one case should not it justify the same thing in another?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. At the moment I cannot give to the gentleman an answer to his question. I submit the gentleman had better ask it of the proper authorities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman headed a committee that returned only a few days ago from Vietnam.

Do I understand correctly that the gentleman in his committee talked to President Diem personally?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We did.

Mr. GROSS. And his brother, Nhu?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We did.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman and his committee also talked to the military commanders, American and Vietnamese?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, as well as legislators of the Vietnam National Assembly, including the President of the National Assembly.

Mr. GROSS. At that time did the gentleman or his committee have information that this coup would be carried out or was imminent and would be carried out in the near future? Was there any indication of that?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If there were indications we would have reported to the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and included it in our report. There were no such indications.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I think that was the report the gentleman made to the committee.

FARMERS AND THE NEW FRONTIER—A REPORT ON THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1st session of the 88th Congress is

drawing to a close, I think it would be appropriate for us all to pause a moment to review again the agricultural record of the New Frontier.

I am sorry to say that for both farmers and taxpayers this record continues to get worse.

Here is what we have seen recently:

The parity ratio for 1962 at 79, the lowest level for a year since 1939—Economic Indicators, U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1963, page 28.

Farm debt at the highest level in history—Farm debt, 1919-63, ERS, USDA, July 1963.

Farming costs at the highest level in history—"Agricultural Prices," Crop Reporting Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture, September 30, 1963, page 1.

Total expenditures of \$8.4 billion by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, an all-time high, in fiscal year 1964—appropriations, REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1964, Office of Budget and Finance, USDA, February 1963.

The greatest number of employees—116,268—in the history of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—"U.S. Budget, Fiscal Year 1964," page 422.

The fewest number of farmers—14.3 million—in the history of our Nation—"Farm Income Situation," FIS 191, USDA, July 1963, page 37.

An alltime low—3.6 million—in the number of farms in this country—"Statistical Reporting Service," U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 28, 1963.

Farm surpluses at continued high levels—USDA press release 3309-63, October 3, 1963, shows CCC investment in farm commodities at \$7,256,551,380 as of June 30, 1963. This compares to \$6,657,026,599 a year earlier.

Farm income sliding—Ibid, 7, page 2. Seasonally adjusted second quarter for 1963 shows net farm income at \$12.6 billion or \$700 million less than 1962 and \$200 million less than 1961. Page 34 shows that realized net income from farming after excluding government payments was lower in 1962 than in 17 of the previous 19 years starting in 1943.

Farm legislation bogged down in Congress with only one major bill being enacted into law.

Farmers rejecting the administration's strict two-price wheat control scheme by an overwhelming margin.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to cause all these events to transpire? While I realize that an endless argument can follow from this simple question, I think it suffices to say that the impact of technology and change in agriculture is by far the most important single reason. Farmers have been able to master the weather, the soil, seeds, fertilizers and Government officials, and still produce the greatest bounty on earth.

Nostalgic remembrances are from time to time heard concerning the so-called golden era of agriculture when the parity ratio was in excess of 100. World War II, the postwar period and the Korean war were, of course, the years of this golden era when American men were fighting and dying for their country.

The wheat fields of France and the rice paddies of Korea were growing land

mines in the golden era and the mere fact that the total volume of world consumption is now higher than it was during the 1940's and 1950's is testimonial only to the fact that there are millions of more people on this planet now than there were just a decade ago.

The actual record of the New Frontier on farm legislation has been dismal.

Do you remember what the 1960 Democratic platform on agriculture said?

The Democratic administration will work to bring about full parity of income for farmers in all segments of agriculture by helping them to balance farm production with the expanding needs of the Nation and the world.

Measures to this end include production and marketing quotas measured in terms of barrels, bushels, and bales, loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity, production payments, commodity purchases, and marketing orders and agreements.

What happened to this promise of high prices and strict controls? Present law is clear on the authority of Secretary Freeman to set price supports at 90 percent of parity on the basics now grown under crop controls such as rice, peanuts, cotton and wheat.

He could set these crops at 60 percent of parity with a stroke of his pen. Yet he has not—in fact, not one single farm commodity is now or has been supported at 90 percent of parity by the Kennedy administration.

Why? The reason is simple. The Democratic Party has repudiated 90 percent of parity in practice but not in promise.

Do you remember what Candidate John F. Kennedy said in 1960?

Speaking at the Farmers Union GFA Convention, St. Paul, Minn., October 2, 1960, he said:

Third, I would support farm programs which will raise farm income to full parity levels as soon as it is feasible to do so. By parity income, I mean an income which will give average farm producers a return on their farming investment, their labor and their managerial effort equal to the returns that are earned by comparable resources in other industries.

That, of course, was another promise which falls far short when measured against performance.

As to the parity principle as a bedrock of farm policy, let me point out that the present tobacco price support program which is generally cited as a paragon of virtue by advocates of "supply management" or controls for agriculture is based on a formula apart and distinct from the parity formula. It is a formula designed to prevent a rise in tobacco price supports. It is a frozen ceiling on support prices. Measured in terms of parity, tobacco supports are now in the low range.

Another recent example of this administration abandoning the parity principle is found in the perline cotton bill which calls for substantial new subsidies to textile mills. Under the terms of that legislation the price support for cotton would in future years no longer be related to parity, but would be tied to the cost of production.

WHAT IS HAPPENING?

During this session of Congress only one major farm bill, a 2-year extension

19892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

November 1962

of the feed grain program, has been enacted into law.

We all recall how hastily it was forced through Congress in an effort to persuade wheat farmers to vote "right" in last May's referendum.

As things turned out this last-minute effort which prevented the Senate from even correcting a typographical error was as equally futile as the months of high-pressure sales tactics used by Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture to promote the certificate wheat plan.

As a result of numerous abuses, the Secretary was legislatively scolded by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with the Senate adding this language to the fiscal year 1964 appropriations bill:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used, (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

As a result of further congressional disapproval, the Secretary also withdrew the loyalty pledge that he had required of all farmer-elected committeemen.

In spite of all the high-pressure tactics a majority of wheat farmers voted down the strict control plan designed for them by Messrs. Kennedy, Cochrane, and Freeman.

Prior to the referendum many wheat State Members of Congress began to work on a constructive alternative to the administration's "rule or ruin" plan. After the referendum's defeat, over 50 wheat bills were introduced in Congress, but up to the present time the administration has remained adamant in refusing to consider remedial wheat legislation while preferring to let the wheat farmer "stew in his own juice."

The reason most often cited by the Secretary is that wheat farmers are divided on a program. That argument, however, did not dissuade the Secretary from pushing the 40-year-old, oft-rejected, two-price wheat plan through Congress and to a referendum where farmers in only five States found it acceptable.

LIVESTOCK VENDETTA

The administration's displeasure with wheat farmers as a result of the referendum is mild compared to the continuing vendetta it is carrying out against livestock farmers.

Let us recall for just one moment that the livestock industry is, by far, free from government control and subsidy. It has historically been the bulwark of opposition to the fancy control schemes of the New Frontier.

Among other things here are some of the things the administration has been doing to livestock farmers.

First. This administration proposed in 1961 that there be hen, heifer, and hog quotas.

Do you remember section 360(a) of H.R. 6400, the administration's 1961 farm proposal?

It provided:

SUBTITLE C—MARKETING QUOTAS

Part VII—Marketing quotas for specified agricultural commodities

Sec. 360(a). This part covers any agricultural commodity including but not limited to the following: corn, tobacco, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, grass seeds, vegetables (including potatoes), fruits, tree nuts and seeds, hogs, cattle, lamb, chicken, turkeys, whole milk, butterfat, eggs, hops, honey, and gum naval stores. Any regional or market classification, type or grade of any agricultural commodity covered by this part may be treated as a separate "commodity" hereunder.

Happily, this provision was rejected by Congress.

Second. Do you remember section 440 of H.R. 10010, the administration's 1962 farm proposal?

It provided:

SUBTITLE C—DAIRY

Reports and records

Sec. 440. Each first processor and producer shall keep such records for such period of time and shall make such reports as the Secretary shall prescribe for the purposes of this subtitle. The Secretary is hereby authorized to examine such records and any other records, accounts, documents, and other papers which he has reason to believe are relevant for the purposes of this subtitle and which are in the custody or control of such first processor or producer. Any person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by the Secretary, pursuant to this subtitle, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Happily, this provision too was rejected by Congress, but a proposal to imprison a dairy farmer in a Federal penitentiary for failing to keep a record or for refusing to let a Federal official snoop about his personal records or any other material deemed relevant by the Secretary would seem preposterous had it not been recommended by the President of the United States.

Third. Do you remember H.R. 6491 and H.R. 7154, the administration's 1963 proposals on land retirement?

These bills would have removed the \$10 million ceiling on the cropland conversion program and allowed unrestrained grazing of new cropland as well as on the formerly idle land coming out of the cropland reserve program. Needless to say, this would mean a severe hardship for all livestock farmers if Government subsidized grazing were allowed.

Fourth. Do you realize the extent of livestock imports at this time?

Four hundred and eighty-one million dollars' worth of meat products were imported into the United States in 1962, and 1963 imports are running at the same high rate.

Imports of boneless beef and veal, for example, have risen from 88 million pounds in 1957 to 819 million pounds in 1962—an increase of 1,000 percent. The October 28 issue of the USDA publication, "Foreign Agriculture," also shows these figures for 1963:

U.S. imports of red meat in the August period of 1963 totaled 839 million pounds, up 18 percent from the same period last year.

U.S. imports of boneless beef, the major category, rose by 20 percent to 605 million pounds, and those of canned meat by about 50 percent to 75 million pounds.

Nine ships left Australia during the month of September, with 27,301, 20 pounds of beef, 403,200 pounds of mutton, 51,520 pounds of lamb, and 24,640 pounds of variety meats to the United States.

Meat shipments to the United States from New Zealand totaled 203 million pounds in the 11-month period beginning October 1, 1962. Beef and veal accounted for 94 percent of these shipments.

Many livestock producers wish that the administration would devote as much effort to control harmful and excessive imports as it does to controlling the American farmer.

In spite of this serious situation nothing is being done to stop it.

Fifth. Do you remember the chicken war in the European Common Market? That is still going on and we are losing it. The Europeans have made no real concessions and they have, in fact, raised U.S. pork levies from 9.5 to 20 percent valorem and have raised U.S. lamb duties from 1.6 cents a pound to 4.6 cents a pound, thus substantially reducing sheep exports to Europe.

I am sorry to see the hostile attitude that this administration has against the livestock industry which is of such prime importance to our Nation's agricultural sector.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

The farm program is heading for a fall unless something is done to bring it back into sensible perspective. The point is a simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the present crazy-quilt price support and control program held together by Mr. Freeman was born in depression, matured in war and is now in a fatal position.

The change from rural to urban dominance of both the national Congress and the State legislatures is becoming more and more pronounced.

If farmers of the 1960's and 1970's are going to continue to provide Americans and the world with food and fiber, the concept of abundance must be forced on them.

We must forget the foolishness that the New Frontier espoused on agriculture. Ski lifts and snow machines financed by subsidized Government money, 31 farms for every U.S. Department of Agriculture bureaucrat, and only 11 acres out of a 140,000-acre cropland conversion program sold to the public as recreation activity are but a few of the wastes and extravagances that must be curtailed if the general public and the Congress are ever to look on farm programs as something more than a multi-billion-dollar boondoggle.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call upon all segments and shades of opinion within the agricultural community to draw immediate attention to a sound and rational farm program. The Kennedy administration, having complete control of Congress, has the voter to bring this about. The responsibility for the enactment of sound and realistic farm programs, therefore, should be placed on it.